

CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Vol. LXII

PITTSBURGH, PA., JUNE 1928

No. 6

Can the Eighteenth Amendment be Repealed?

E are told that while the soldiers were fighting for the country overseas, the prohibitionists took away their right to drink. The Congress that passed the Eighteenth Amendment was elected before the soldiers left for France, and as prohibition was an important issue in that campaign these soldiers knew exactly who and what they were voting for. Furthermore, it would not have made any difference if they had not voted for the members of Congress because the soldiers who went to France were just a horizontal slice of the manhood of America. They voted proportionately as the rest of the Americans did.

There is a clamor on the part of many of those who are opposed to prohibition, for a popular vote on the Eighteenth Amendment. Such a popular vote would signify nothing, nor could it possibly change anything. The Eighteenth Amendment was adopted just as every one of the preceding seventeen amendments were adopted. Why should an exception be made in the case of the Eighteenth Amendment? There was a greater difference of opinion on some of the constitutional amendments than there was regarding the Eighteenth.

The law requires that an amendment to the Constitution shall be adopted by a two-thirds vote of Congress, which vote must afterwards be ratified by a three-fourths vote of the various State Legislative bodies. If the "wets" had been able to con-

trol either branch of the Legislature in thirteen states they could have prevented the adoption of the Amendment. That is, all they needed to do was to control thirteen branches of the Legislature in thirteen states out of a possible 96 branches. It is understood, of course, that each of the 48 states has two separate Legislative bodies. But the "drys" carried 93 branches of the Legislature out of 48 States, and the "wets" were able to carry only three branches in two States: two in Rhode Island and one in Connecticut.

It is now proposed by the "wets" that they repeal the Eighteenth Amendment. How can they do it? There is only one way. If the "wets" want to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment they will have to do what the "drys" had to do—carry two-thirds of the Congress and three-fourths of the States—which means that if the "drys" can hold only thirteen branches of the Legislature in thirteen States, out of a possible 96 branches, the "wets" will never be able to repeal the Amendment to the Constitution. The shoe is now on the other foot. And when the "wets" hold out the faintest hope that they can amend the Constitution in this way, they either lie or they are totally ignorant of the real sentiment of the people of this country. The fact is that in practically every case since the Eighteenth Amendment was adopted and where a vote was taken by the people, the ballot in favor of prohibition has increased year by year.

IN SOCIAL ROOM
MONTGOMERY HALL

The Right to Drink—A Discussion of Personal Liberty

IS the objection to prohibition based upon the loss of personal liberty a valid one? How has the principle of prohibition in relation to personal liberty been regarded in other human relationships? For this is by no means a new issue.

As a matter of fact, there is no such thing as an absolute individual right to do any particular thing, or to eat or drink any particular thing, or to enjoy the association of one's own family, or to conduct one's business, or to use one's property, as one pleases, if that thing is in conflict with "the law of public necessity."

Consideration of Public Rights

If a member of your family becomes ill with a highly contagious disease, he is quarantined—no one is allowed to visit him excepting those who minister to his needs. When a great fire breaks out in a congested district, buildings surrounding the fire are blown up in order to prevent the further spread of the fire. These measures are resorted to for the common good.

We are told by the liquor men that the state has no right to tell us whom we shall marry. But suppose you, a white man, were to select a negro woman—or suppose you, a negro, were to select a white woman. What do you suppose would happen in some states?

Suppose you were to select as your wife an imbecile or a lunatic? Legislation on this point isn't quite so far along as it might be, but there's no doubt that soon there will be complete prohibition in this respect, in order to help wipe out imbecility and lunacy. You can't marry your cousin in some states; you can't marry your sister in any state, and you will find it difficult to marry a divorced woman under some circumstances.

It is insisted that the physical and moral weaknesses of mankind must not be perpetuated through the children born of defective parents. The state declares that it must protect itself against such misfortune, no matter how much some individuals may suffer.

To prevent the spread of disease, the state has decreed that no longer shall a common drinking cup be used, and the common towel in the hotel washroom is being abolished. Suppose you tried to shoot game in your own woods, or to fish for trout

in your own private stream when the law forbids you to do so. Suppose you tried to smoke in your factory, or to run your automobile wherever and however you please. In all these things men are being restricted for the good of society as a whole.

You are not permitted to spend your wages as you please if you have a family to support—you must first provide for your family.

You are not permitted to keep your back yard or your kitchen or your cellar in a bad sanitary condition, because by so doing you would endanger the lives and health of your neighbors. You are not permitted to keep your children out of school, even though you yourself do not believe in education, because these children also belong to the state, and it is the wish of the state to make them good citizens, so it insists upon compulsory education.

The Stake of the State

You are not permitted to use habit-forming drugs, because, among other reasons, if you do so you may make yourself a burden to the state. No man has a right to drink if by so doing he poisons himself or makes himself an unfit member of society, compelling the state to cure him, support him when he is unable to take care of himself, lock him up when he is dangerous to be at large, bury him at public expense when he is a corpse, and take care of his family after he is gone.

It is much easier for six people to live together in peace than it is for six hundred to live in harmony. But there are over one hundred million of us in this country, and each of us thinks that he is just as good as the other fellow, if not a little bit better. Suppose each of us tried to do just as we pleased? It would create a hopeless situation.

There was a time when men honestly believed that they had a right to own slaves—because they thought it was purely a question of property rights—but today we know it is also a moral question.

There was a time when men honestly believed that all they needed to do to get a wife was to take a club and hit the woman of their choice on the head and drag her home, but today—well, women have something to say about it.

There was a time when men honestly believed that they had an ab-

solute right to do with their children as they pleased, but today they recognize the fact that children have rights of their own.

Slaves, women, children—these have come to their own because a new conception of rights and duties has dawned upon men. They discovered that there is a more fundamental question than property rights—that duty is a bigger word than rights. And so the weaker members of society are today being given a better chance.

But we still hark back to the property rights period and the question of personal liberty when we discuss the saloon and the liquor business. We forget that the biggest thing in this discussion is duty and sacrifice—for the sake of the weaker members of society—and we should be ready to give up our rights when the well-being of mankind as a whole is concerned. The man who is ready to do this proves that he is a big man—the little man always stands out for his rights no matter what happens.

Fundamental Law and Personal Liberty

In law and in civilization the first consideration is not the individual, but society. Therefore, whatever injures society is not permitted. The greater our civilization, the more restricted become our liberties. We may enjoy civic liberty only as we are willing to sacrifice personal liberty. This does not mean that we actually surrender anything. Each of us is asked to give up some little things and put them into the common fund which makes up the sum of all our comforts in a civilized community, but each of us draws out of that common fund more than any of us puts in. We may exercise our personal liberty only in so far as we do not place any additional burdens upon our neighbors or upon the state.

No normal man would prefer to live in a state of barbarism where every one does absolutely as he pleases without regard to the well-being of his neighbors. He would rather make some sacrifices which mean comparatively little to him in order that he, too, might make a contribution to the civilization which is bringing happiness and comfort to all.

(Continued on page 8, col. 2)

Prohibition in America

Charles Stelzle, in "*The World's Work*"

A STUDY of nearly one thousand cities covering every state in the Union concerning the attitude of special groups of leaders in various fields toward prohibition indicates a strong sentiment in favor of the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act. Those whose opinions were sought included editors of daily newspapers, superintendents of high schools, chiefs of police, health officers, clergymen, employers of labor, editors of labor papers, secretaries of central labor bodies and national labor unions. A total of thirty different questions were asked covering various phases of the prohibition issue, the purpose being not to prove that prohibition was a good or bad influence, but rather to find out what America actually thinks about prohibition today.

Liquor Men's Prophecies Unfulfilled

Before the Eighteenth Amendment was adopted, we were told that if prohibition were to be enacted, one million workingmen would lose their jobs; that taxes would be so increased that workingmen would forfeit their homes; that manufacturers of machinery and all other materials used in the production and distribution of liquor would go bankrupt; that railroads which transported these articles as well as the raw materials used in making liquor would suffer from the great reduction in business; that saloon property would remain idle, resulting in practical confiscation; that first-class hotels would close their doors because their chief profits came across the bar; that there would be an unprecedented increase in the use of opium and other narcotics; and that much sickness and higher death rates would result because those accustomed to using liquor could not get along without it. Practically none of these things happened, because immediately following prohibition there came an unprecedented period of prosperity to the United States. It is true that prohibition alone was not responsible for this prosperity, but according to the best authorities it had a most important part in its production. And this was very generally conceded by those who responded to the questionnaire.

Organized Labor's Protest

Naturally, the strongest opposition to prohibition came from repre-

sentatives of organized labor, and frequent references were made to resolutions adopted by the annual conventions of the American Federation of Labor, favoring such modification of the existing law as will permit the "manufacture and vending of wholesome beer and light wines". For the most part, however, it was perfectly clear that even when workingmen themselves did not use intoxicating liquor, there was a feeling of resentment against the rich or well-to-do in this country who deliberately flouted the prohibition law because they felt themselves above such law, and because they did not propose to have their social practices ordered by legislation. This was frequently referred to in the letters received from representatives of Central Labor Bodies and International organizations. Occasionally a labor official would refer to the "lost jobs" for which prohibition was responsible. It should be remembered, however, that before the Eighteenth Amendment was adopted, only 62,920 wage earners were employed in breweries and distilleries, but of these 62,920 less than one-quarter were bona fide brewers, maltsters, distillers and rectifiers, fully three-quarters being engaged in occupations which were not at all peculiar to the production of liquor, as for example, blacksmiths, carpenters, coopers, electricians, machinists, painters, plumbers and firemen. There were more teamsters than brewers employed by breweries.

Editors for Prohibition

It has often been assumed, particularly by prohibitionists, that the newspapers of the country were opposed to the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act. But, the replies received from three hundred representative editors of daily newspapers in as many different cities indicated that seventy-three per cent were in favor of the Eighteenth Amendment and sixty-one per cent favored the Volstead Act. While a comparatively small number were altogether opposed to prohibition, most of them who did not approve of it outright favored some kind of a modification of the prohibition law. The number of letters received by these editors on the prohibition question was about equally divided between the "wets" and the "drys", although it was said by some that the "wets" wrote more

often presumably because they had something to gain, whereas with the "drys" the prohibition question was settled.

Young People Not "Hootch" Carriers

Many reckless statements are being made as to the increased drinking among young people. The reports from practically every group in this study indicate that this is an exaggeration. This is particularly true among high school students. The superintendents repudiate the charge that students carry "hootch" on their hips. Very few among the entire number admitted that this was practiced by any of the students in their schools, or that liquor was used at parties given by students, and they insisted in general that the attitude of students toward any individual who was caught with a flask, or who may have become intoxicated, was never one of admiration. It was almost invariably one of disapproval, although amusement, indifference or contempt frequently expressed their opinions. However, as is typical among young people, they frequently admired the boy who "got away" with an infraction of the law. In practically no instance have school boards found it necessary to take any action whatsoever regarding the use of liquor by students. Apparently, almost every high school in the country has courses of study on the effects of alcohol on the human body, particularly in their classes on hygiene and physiology.

Decreased Deaths from Alcoholism

One of the striking evidences of the changed liquor situation in our country today is the greatly reduced number of Keeley Cures and similar institutions. However, it is stated that departments for the treatment of alcoholism are now established in regular hospitals and sanitariums. But, health officers throughout the country, who responded to our questionnaire, stated that the number of such adjuncts to sanitariums had not been measurably increased, at least not sufficiently to take the place of institutions which formerly cared for inebriates. It was frankly stated by many that the "hootch" which they drank often killed men too quickly to require the more leisurely treatment of the sanitarium. The number of deaths

(Continued on page 6, col. 1)

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

*Founded in 1867*Devoted to Christian Political and Social
Science*Official Organ of*

THE NATIONAL REFORM ASS'N,

An organization of Christian citizens founded in 1861

Published Monthly at the Association's
Headquarters, 209 Ninth St.,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

R. H. MARTIN, Editor-in-Chief

Rates, \$1.00 the year, payable in advance.
Entered as Second Class Matter, July 30,
1906 at Pittsburgh, Pa. under Act of Congress
of March 3, 1879.A Clean-Cut Moral
Issue Campaign

HE is a bold prophet who would undertake to forecast developments in the presidential election contest on which we are entering. Nevertheless at present writing it seems that Al Smith, a "wet" both by profession and record, will be the Presidential nominee of the Democratic party. While no Republican Presidential candidate has the lead over his competitors that Al Smith has over his, Herbert Hoover, whose record classes him as a "dry," is clearly in the lead. Even though Republican politicians should prevent his nomination the other Republican candidates prominently mentioned are likewise "dry".

Hence it looks as if we are facing a great political contest in which there will be a clean cut moral issue—the maintenance and effective enforcement of prohibition—and this the dominant issue of the campaign. If Al Smith is nominated prohibition will not be the only moral issue of the campaign but, in the large, those who will vote against the New York Governor on the prohibition issue will be against him on other moral issues.

Politicians in both parties will endeavor to prevent a clean-cut on prohibition or any other moral issue in the campaign. We hope they will fail. They ought to fail. The prohibition question is to the fore in the public mind throughout the country. No other question is so much discussed in newspapers and magazines. Quite recently leading "wets"—Butler, Edwards, Edge, Richie, Reed—were loud in their demands that prohibition be made the issue in the coming Presidential election, though they are strangely silent now. The leaders of the "drys" are making the same demand. Representatives of thirty-three organizations favoring prohibition, in the National Conference for Prohibition Enforcement Planks in 1928 platforms and for Dry Candidates, held in Washington, D.C., Feb-

ruary, 28, 1928, unanimously adopted resolutions calling upon the conventions of our political parties to include in their platforms "positive, clean-cut, declarations pledging the support of the party and nominees to a program of vigorous and efficient enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment and necessary supporting legislation and to nominate candidates committed to this policy of effective prohibition law enforcement by their utterances, acts and records." Church bodies are making similar demands. Very recently the convention of the Southern Baptist Church with a membership of 3,700,000 adopted a resolution pledging their voting constituency to break party lines rather than see "an unnamed friend of the liquor interests" become President of the United States. Evidently it is the will of the American people that prohibition be an issue, if not the issue, in the Presidential campaign. Will the politicians dare to oppose this will? Let every good citizen bring the weight of his influence to bear upon these politicians and upon the delegates to the National Political Convention to see that they do not. The Continuation Committee of the Washington Prohibition Conference will be on the ground at both Kansas City and Houston to exert every influence in their power to prevent their doing so.

There will be a distinct advantage in having a clean-cut contest on this moral issue in the Presidential election. The "wets" are declaring the sentiment of the country is decidedly against prohibition. The "drys" assert the opposite. Let the issue be drawn in the Presidential election. This will afford as fair a chance politically as we are likely to have in a long time to test this matter out. Let us have a show down. Let us find out where we are at and the direction in which we are going.

In a clean-cut moral issue campaign we predict one of the greatest political contests in the history of our country. We welcome such a contest. Let it come. It will be no one-sided affair. It will be a hard fought battle, possibly a close battle, but of the outcome we are unafraid.

The liquor men tell us in one breath that the Volstead Act cannot be enforced, that you cannot get a judge or jury to convict. Then they point in scorn to the overcrowded conditions of our jails and penitentiaries due to the enforcement of the prohibition law. They cannot get us both coming and going. Either they lied one time or they lied the other. The probabilities are that they lied both times.

Saloon Responsible for
Prohibition

PROHIBITION was not adopted because some long-haired men and short-haired women, not wanting to drink themselves, did not want anybody else to drink. The liquor problem was practically concentrated in the nearly 200,000 saloons and places where liquor was sold in this country. These saloons became a stench in the nostrils of the American people. They disregarded the law. They sold to minors. They sold to inebriates. They sold on Sunday. Many of them, when they opened their doors, threw their keys into the streets. They harbored crooks, blacklegs, prostitutes, gamblers, gunmen, and every sort of disreputable person. They entered politics and controlled our municipal life. We tried to reform them, but it could not be done. They laughed at us. They swore at us. They walked all over us. We tried high license and low license and local option and model saloons, but they would not work. And we finally voted the saloon out of business and it is going to stay there.

No—Prohibition was not enacted primarily to stop the people from drinking. It was the saloon that made us mad, and it is the saloon that is responsible for prohibition. Please note, by the way, that the chief agency in promoting prohibition has been the "Anti-Saloon League," not the "Anti-Liquor League." The Anti-Saloon League was not primarily a prohibition organization. It was aimed at the saloon as an institution. They tell us that nobody wants the saloon back, not even the liquor men. But the open sale of wine and beer at any retail place may create, substantially, what was formerly found in the saloon. It is going to be extremely difficult to prevent the establishment of places in which liquor may be consumed even though it may not be purchased there. If it is impossible to enforce the law now, how is it going to be possible when still more intoxicating liquor will be consumed? Furthermore, does anyone imagine that by some magic process the increased sale of beer and wine will decrease the number of drunkards, will decrease or wipe out poverty, insanity, and lawlessness, which they say we have under prohibition, or which we had before prohibition went into effect?

Workingmen and Personal Liberty

The trade unionist should be the last man in the world to talk about "personal liberty."

Suppose a strike were ordered on a job upon which the trade unionist is working, would he dare resist the strike order?

Suppose it had been decided by the labor union that eight hours constituted a day's work, would he dare work nine or ten or twelve?

Suppose the labor union law declared there should be no Sunday work, would a trade unionist insist upon working a seven-day week if he felt like doing so?

Suppose the rules of the union prohibited him from working with non-union men, would he be found on the same job with such men?

Practically every law of the labor union infringes upon the "personal liberty" of the trade unionist. The doctrine of personal liberty is a relic of the Old Manchester School of extreme individualism. There is absolutely no room for this philosophy in the trade union movement.

The doctrine of personal liberty carried out to its logical conclusion would wipe out every labor union in the world.

The best possible argument for the labor union is that it looks upon the problems of the workers from the standpoint of the great mass of workingmen and not from the standpoint of the individual. When a man joins a labor union he forfeits his personal liberty for the common interest of the workingmen of his class.

Theoretically, at least, the labor union takes care of the weakest man—the one who is least able to defend himself, brings him into the organization and then stands by him to the limit. It does the same thing for women and children who cannot fight their own battles. The fight for prohibition is based upon much the same principle—its chief object is to take care of the weakest members of society.

If every man may do as he pleases about the liquor business, then by the same token he may do as he pleases about the labor business. By what right does the union insist that a boss unionize his shop if every man may do as he pleases? By what right does the union insist that the boss shall run his plant upon an eight-hour basis? Why should the union declare with fervor that he must pay the union scale of wages? There is only one reason—namely, because the union believes that by insisting upon these

matters the great mass of workingmen will be benefited.

Workingmen cannot do as they please in the industrial world—there are too many interests to be conserved. No more dare they do as they please with regard to the liquor business. Their personal liberty is the last thing to be considered. The first consideration is the well-being of the majority.

Where Labor Stands on the Liquor Question

OFFICERS of labor unions rarely express their real convictions concerning prohibition—first, because their jobs are always in jeopardy on account of the great rivalry of candidates for office, and second, because delegates to Central Labor Unions, for example, invariably support bar tenders, brewery workers and other workingmen who are identified in any way with the liquor business, not because they, themselves, necessarily approve of the business, but because at some future time, they may require the support and the votes of the liquor men in question.

The official attitude of the American Federation of Labor toward prohibition in recent years has been one of opposition, particularly regarding the Volstead Act. In their conventions they have come out in favor of beer and light wines. But such action on the part of the American Federation of Labor toward prohibition is on a par with that taken by delegates to Central Labor Unions, and it is a question whether it actually represents the convictions of the great mass of members of labor unions in this country.

Fortunately, the attitude of organized labor to the liquor business and toward the use of liquor, itself, has been expressed at various times when the question of politics did not enter.

For example, Samuel Gompers in three different reports submitted to Annual Conventions of the American Federation of Labor, called attention to the evils of the saloon, and to the constant desire among the membership of labor unions to hold their meetings in halls on the premises of which there was no sale of intoxicants.

In one of these reports Mr. Gompers said:

"In the interest of sobriety and morality I again urge that this Convention strongly recommend to our affiliated organizations throughout the country that they should organ-

ize a movement which would permit the use of our public school-rooms for the evening meetings of our Labor Organizations."

Another slant on the attitude of labor toward prohibition is that given by the constitutions and by-laws of the one hundred and eight (108) National and International Unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. A study of these constitutions indicates that approximately one-half of the organizations recognize the evil of the use of intoxicating liquor and have taken legislative action regarding it.

In this study the results were tabulated as follows:

First: Unions taking definite action.

Second: Unions taking no action.

Third: Unions not heard from.

In the first group the membership amounted to 2,015,800; in the second 727,900; and in the third 117,500;—so that those unions which had taken action recognizing the evils of intoxicating liquor numbered over two-thirds of the entire membership of the American Federation of Labor. It should be remembered that this action was recorded in constitutions issued years after the Eighteenth Amendment was adopted.

The unions taking action against the use of liquor by their members under certain conditions, penalized them as follows:

They denied disability benefits to those injured on account of the use of liquor.

They would not pay sick or death benefits to those killed or injured while intoxicated.

They rejected petitions for membership if the applicant was known to be an habitual drinker.

They censured or reprimanded those who entered the meeting in an intoxicated condition, and sometimes they suspended them.

A dozen other specifications are listed, discouraging the excessive use of intoxicating liquor.

From all of this it may be concluded that if the workingmen of America could express their opinions free from political and official trade union influence, the sentiment against prohibition would not be nearly so prevalent as the liquor men would lead us to suppose.

Clarence Darrow once said that he had as much right to drink a glass of whiskey as any other man had to drink a cup of tea. But you never heard of one man killing another man while he was under the influence of tea.

Straw Votes Indicate Small Percentage against Prohibition

The value of straw votes on the prohibition question has often been doubted, largely because of geographical and sociological differences among the voters. But it is interesting that in the two most conspicuous votes of this character—that taken by the Literary Digest in 1922 in which approximately 900,000 votes were cast, and that sponsored by the Newspaper Enterprise Association in 1926, in which 326 newspapers located in as many different cities participated, and in which about 1,800,000 ballots were cast—the vote for repeal in the Literary Digest ballot was only 20.6% and that in the Newspaper Enterprise Association group was 31.3%. While there was a very considerable vote for modification in both cases, there can be no doubt that the comparatively small vote for repeal indicated that the preponderance of sentiment, so far as these voters were concerned, was against the liquor business as it had been conducted previous to the

passage of the Eighteenth Amendment.

The meaning of modification in the minds of the voters undoubtedly implied a great variety of things. It is probable that it had as much to do with the method of enforcing the law as it had with the alcoholic content of that which was sold. If they had been in favor of the law as it was before the passing of the Amendment, they would unquestionably have voted for repeal. Also, if it is assumed that those who voted in favor of modification were against the repeal of the Amendment, it must further be assumed that they favored only such modification as is permissible under the Amendment, and the only modification permissible would be a law increasing the alcoholic content from $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent to a per cent a little higher, but not high enough to be intoxicating. But to repeat, at the very worst, less than one-third of those who cast their ballots in the newspaper poll were in favor of repealing the Eighteenth Amendment.

Prohibition in America

(Continued from page 3)

from alcoholism and from wood and denatured alcohol poisoning was another, although not an absolutely accurate, slant on the number of users of intoxicants. Two sets of figures on the number of deaths per 100,000 policy holders from alcoholism for the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and the New York Life Insurance Company are submitted for the years 1914, 1915, 1916 and for the ten year periods following, namely 1924, 1925 and 1926:

Number of Deaths from Alcoholism per 100,000 Policy Holders

	Metropolitan	New York
	Life	Life
1914	4.8	5.1
1915	4.3	4.0
1916	5.4	4.5
1924	3.2	1.7
1925	3.3	1.6
1926	4.1	1.6

It will be observed that the death-rate has decreased in both companies during the ten year period, although in the case of the Metropolitan Life there was an increase during the period from 1924 to 1926. It should be kept in mind that probably four-fifths of the policy holders of the Metropolitan Life Insur-

ance Company are of the industrial class, while those insured by the New York Life are largely of the middle and upper classes. This would indicate either that workingmen drink more injurious liquor or that the quantity of liquor which they consume is greater. The probabilities are, however, that the policy holders of the New York Life Insurance Company can afford to buy a better and safer brand. In any event, the main point to be considered at this time is that there has been a decrease in the death-rates from alcoholism among both groups during the periods mentioned. The figures on deaths from alcoholism throughout the United States as a whole are substantially the same as those given for the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

Toxicity of Bootleg Liquor

An important factor to be considered with reference to the number of persons who drink, and which is closely related to the number of arrests for drunkenness is the increased toxicity of bootleg liquor; that is, to put it practically, according to medical authorities, bootleg liquor acts about ten times more quickly in producing intoxication than medicinal liquors dispensed by government permit, so that it requires only one-tenth as much of bootleg liquor as pre-prohibition

liquor to produce a given degree of drunkenness. The reason for this is that bootleg is so concentrated and almost invariably contains other and more deadly poisons than mere ethyl alcohol. If, as Prof. Fisher points out in his book "Prohibition at its Worst", out of a given number of drinkers, twice as many now get drunk on bootleg liquor as used to on pre-prohibition liquor, we should expect twice as many arrests as formerly, even if the number of drinkers were the same. To put it in another way, even though the number of drinkers were reduced one-half by prohibition, the number of arrests for drunkenness would remain the same.

Beer Drinkers also Drink Whiskey

It is very generally stated by those who are opposed to prohibition that permission to drink beer and light wines would greatly decrease the use of whiskey. In 1912 my staff made a study in New York City of how workingmen spent their spare time and their spare cash. Over one thousand workingmen were interviewed, and each filled out a blank which contained over one hundred questions which gave very minute information concerning their attitude toward recreational problems. These workingmen were engaged in 164 different trades and occupations, and there were 29 different nationalities represented. They were almost equally divided between Catholics, Jews and Protestants. It was revealed in this study that about 55 per cent of the men drank liquor of various kinds; 53 per cent drank beer, and 21 per cent drank whiskey. That is, of those who drank intoxicants, 38 per cent drank whiskey. This proves that the fact that workingmen could drink beer did not necessarily keep them from drinking whiskey.

Those who deliberately violate the law and disregard the Constitution because of their appetite for cocktails may some day face a situation in which workingmen who hunger for bread will defy other laws and appropriate for themselves that which will satisfy their hunger. The slogan, "to hell with the Constitution" is a boomerang. If one class in this country declares that it will obey only those laws of which it approves, then by the same token another class has an exactly equal right to disregard any other set of laws which may hinder it in securing that which it desires.

Association Activities

On April 23rd, Dr. R. H. Martin addressed the Methodist Episcopal Ministerium of Philadelphia, on "Christ and Government". More than one hundred ministers were present. On June 4th he is to speak at the Presbyterian ministers' meeting of the same city.

To give Commander John D. Pennington and his staff in their efficient and fearless enforcement of the Prohibition Law the support of our Association and to strengthen public sentiment on behalf of the prohibition cause, the article in the last issue of The Christian Statesman on Commander Pennington's work, entitled "Prohibition Can Be Enforced," with additions, has been printed in leaflet form for wide distribution. One hundred thousand copies of this leaflet judiciously distributed throughout the Sixth Prohibition District, comprising the 25 counties of Western Pennsylvania and the 55 counties of West Virginia, would be a worthwhile contribution to this cause. Will not some of our friends who realize the critical stage through which the prohibition cause is now passing, send us a contribution to enable us to distribute this leaflet up to at least 100,000 copies?

On the afternoon and evening of May 14th under the auspices of the National Reform Association, a Beaver County Rally in the interests of prohibition and other vital issues was held in the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Beaver, Pennsylvania. A special feature of the Rally was a Testimonial Dinner for Commander John D. Pennington, Federal Prohibition Administrator, his chief legal advisor, Louis E. Graham and Dr. Ella M. George, president of the Pennsylvania W. C. T. U. and also a member of the Board of Directors of the National Reform Association. Hon. Frank E. Reader, President Judge of Beaver County, presided at the dinner at which fitting recognition was given to the loyal and efficient service to the cause of Prohibition by those in whose honor the dinner was held. Two hundred and fifty representative people attended the dinner among whom were United States District Attorney John D. Meyer and Judge Robert M. Ewing of Pittsburgh, Hon. George D. Weingarten, State Senator from New Castle, Hons. Willard S. Reader, H. B. Richardson and A. S. Batchelor, representatives of Beaver County in the State Legislature and Judges Wil-

liam A. McConnell and George A. Baldwin.

The dinner was followed by a public meeting attended by 500 persons at which Commander Pennington spoke briefly of the work accomplished by his staff and Dr. Charles Stelzle of New York City delivered the main address on "What About Prohibition." Judge McConnell of the Beaver County Court presided.

At the afternoon session Dr. William Parsons spoke on "Broken Homes as a Cause of Crime" and Dr. R. H. Martin on "Present Day Battles for the Sabbath".

A movement has been started in Illinois to restore the Bible to the public schools of that state. At the request of the Ministerial Alliance of southern Illinois, Dr. J. M. Wylie of Oakdale, Illinois, long connected with the National Reform Association, addressed a recent meeting of the Alliance on the subject "Should the State Require Devotional Bible Reading in the Public Schools?" The entire morning and afternoon session of the Alliance were given over to the discussion of this subject and the Conference was so thoroughly committed to the project of securing legislation on behalf of daily Bible reading in the schools of the state as to appoint a committee to arrange for hearings before the Methodist Episcopal, Evangelical, Baptist, Christian, Presbyterian and other denominational Conferences or Presbyteries of the state with a view to securing their endorsement of a movement to this end. Since this meeting Dr. Wylie explained the movement before the Methodist Episcopal District Conference of that part of the state, after which the Conference adopted a resolution endorsing the movement.

The National Reform Association is again on the Winona Lake Assembly Program for an extended series of almost fifty addresses. Beginning Monday, July 2nd and continuing each week day up to and including August 11th, a National Reform Association speaker will occupy the ten to eleven o'clock morning hour. This six weeks' program will be followed by a four day Christian Citizenship Conference beginning Monday, August 13th, and occupying the entire forenoon of each day. The general subject for each of the first five weeks, the speaker and the subjects of the daily addresses in the order in which they will be given, follow:

Week Beginning July 2

General Subject: Foundation Principles upon which to Build Enduring National Life.

Speaker, James S. Martin, D.D.

Daily Subjects: The National Reform Program; The Source of the Power Which the State Exercises over the Life and the Property of Its Citizens: The Accountability of Nations to God; The Relation of Governments to Christ; The Standard of Conduct for Nations and Governments; A National Confession of Faith.

Week Beginning July 9

General Subject: Christian Citizenship and Young People.

Speaker, Prof. John H. Dickason.

Daily Subjects: A Message from Number 16,542 to Winona Assembly; A Message from Flaming Youth to Burning Elders; A Message from a Wooden Cross to Needy America; A Message from Uncle Sam to His Partners; A Message from the Battle Front to the Reserves; A Message from the Church to the Taxpayer.

Week Beginning July 16

General Subject: Prohibition—Our Great Social Experiment.

Speaker, William Parsons, D.D.

Daily Subjects: Why Prohibition; Prohibition's Successes; Who's Who in This War?; Where the Machinery Sticks; If We Had a Wet President; Mending the Machine.

Week Beginning July 23

General Subject: Public Education

Speaker, William S. Fleming, D.D.

Daily Subjects: The Cost of Christless Public Education; Christless Public Education Means National Suicide; Substitutes for Christian Public Education; Is Christian Public Education American?; Public Education Can Be Christian; Public Education Must Be Christian.

Week Beginning July 30

General Subject: The Sabbath

Speaker, R. H. Martin, D.D.

Daily Subjects: The Sabbath and the Jew; The Sabbath and Its Lord; The Sabbath and Democracy; The Sabbath and Commercialized Amusements; Sabbath Laws and Court Decisions and Opinions; Securing a Sabbath Law for Our Nation's Capital.

The program of the four day Conference and of the week preceding it will be given in the July issue of The Christian Statesman.

Presidential Powers Over Prohibition

By EDWIN C. DINWIDDIE

WHY do the "drys" insist upon the election of a "dry" President?

Because all powers affecting the enforcement of prohibition converge in him.

I. APPOINTING POWERS: Through his appointing powers alone a "wet" President would wield an immense influence against the policy of prohibition and against its enforcement, and could thus practically destroy the Eighteenth Amendment—the expressed will of the American people. The President appoints:

1. The Secretary of the Treasury, who names Assistant Secretaries, one of whom has general oversight over Customs, Coast Guard and Prohibition Enforcement; as well as the Prohibition Commissioner, the head of the Prohibition Bureau, charged with prohibition enforcement and who controls the permits for handling alcohol for industrial purposes and liquors for permitted uses; also the heads of the Customs and Coast Guard Service, charged with enforcement of the laws against smuggling—all affecting prohibition enforcement.

2. The Attorney General, the head of the Department of Justice and as

such the chief law officer of the Government; also all U. S. District Attorneys and U. S. Marshalls, who prosecute violators of law and hold them in custody.

3. The Secretary of State, Ambassadors and other representatives to other countries with which we maintain diplomatic relations, and one of whose duties is the negotiation of agreements with other friendly nations with respect to smuggling.

4. Members of the United States Supreme Court whenever a vacancy occurs either by resignation or death. The next President will likely be called upon to appoint from four to six members of this Court. By a veto of five against the constitutionality of enforcing legislation to carry the Eighteenth Amendment into effect, this Court could practically destroy National Prohibition. Of course it is only very remotely conceivable that the U. S. Supreme Court might reverse itself and hold against the Eighteenth Amendment.

5. Other Federal Judges, Circuit and District, who try and sentence violators of law.

II. MESSAGES TO CONGRESS: Through the President's

Constitutional powers of informing Congress on the state of the Union, a President can exercise great pressure for or against the policy embodied in the Eighteenth Amendment, and for or against appropriations and legislation to make the Constitutional mandate effective.

III. HEAD OF THE BUDGET: As ex-officio head of the Bureau of the Budget he would practically control the Bureau's estimate of appropriations for enforcement work, thus making it effective or crippling it at will.

IV. PERSONAL EXAMPLE: Through his personal example the President can wield a powerful influence for or against temperate living, and for or against obedience to the letter and the spirit of the law.

HOLD THE LINE! To prevent any rising of a wet tide that might sweep away this law which has proved a blessing to untold millions, the church and temperance forces must hold the line fast at every point against the election of a "wet" as President. The same forces that could elect him would at the same time carry other "wets" into power in State and Nation. **HOLD FAST TO PROHIBITION.**

Modify the Laws?

Let us admit for the sake of argument that the prohibition law cannot be enforced. Neither can any other law be enforced 100 per cent. There is a law against murder, against stealing, against forgery, against embezzlement, against fraudulent stock dealing, and against burglary; but last year, approximately \$2,000,000,000 were secured through violation of these laws. What are we going to do about it? According to the logic of the liquor men, there is only one thing to do: modify the laws. We are too strict about murderers and forgers and burglars anyway. We ought to establish union hours when burglars may "burglary" without being molested. We ought to limit the choice of weapons to axes and crow-bars; no machine guns should be permitted. Besides this, all murderers, burglars, porch climbers, and embezzlers should be compelled to wear a license-plate and to pay a license fee. The government may as well profit by this business because burglars are bound to steal

anyway. This will permit the government to reduce our income tax, and it will put all bootlegging murderers, burglars, porch-climbers, and embezzlers out of business. Why not? Under present conditions we cannot enforce the law against crime anyway.

The Right to Drink

(Continued from page 2)

Justinian has reduced the whole doctrine of law to these principles: "That we should live honestly, should hurt nobody, and should render to every one his due." If these principles were applied to the liquor business and all that goes with it, there would be no room for it.

Blackstone, the great authority on fundamental law, says: "If man were to live in a state of nature unconnected with other individuals, there would be no occasion for any other law than the law of nature and the law of God. But man was formed for society and is neither capable of living alone nor indeed has the courage to do it. The community should guard the rights of

each individual member, and in return for this protection each individual should submit to the law of the community, without which submission of all it is impossible that protection could be extended to any."

When the manufacture and sale of liquor makes life more burdensome to the people, and when it creates social and economic problems which threaten to destroy the finest things in human life; when it destroys men's bodies and souls and becomes a menace to society, then we have a right to destroy the liquor traffic—even though it may cause some inconvenience to a comparatively few people who insist upon exercising their personal liberty.

We accept this principle in every other relationship in life—why not accept it with regard to the liquor business?

From North Carolina, a woman devoted to the cause of Sabbath Observance, sends to our headquarters at one time petitions representing over ten thousand persons, urging the passage of the Lankford Bill.